

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE CONFIRMATION NO. 07/18/2003 10/623,145 George K. Stookey 22076-2 5211 **EXAMINER** 04/04/2006 Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry LLP SAYALA, CHHAYA D Bank One Center/Tower ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER **Suite 3700** 111 Monument Circle 1761 Indianapolis, IN 46204-5137

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			5
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<i>V</i>
	10/623,145	STOOKEY, GEORGE K.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	C. SAYALA	1761	
The MAILING DATE of this communi Period for Reply	cation appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum sta - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply v Any reply received by the Office later than three months af earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a unication. tutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC will, by statute, cause the application to become A	IICATION. The reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status		•	
1) Responsive to communication(s) file	d on		
	2b)⊠ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition to closed in accordance with the practice	for allowance except for formal ma	•	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/ar 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restrict	re withdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the		= .	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are:			
Applicant may not request that any objec Replacement drawing sheet(s) including		` ,	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim f a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority of 2. Certified copies of the priority of 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internation * See the attached detailed Office action	documents have been received. documents have been received in a of the priority documents have been hal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) X Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT	4) ☐ Interview FO-948) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/623,145

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spanier et al. (US Patents 5011679 and 5114704) in view of Witt et al. (U Patent 6350438) or Glandorf et al. (US Patent 6521216) and further in view of Perlberg et al. (US Patent 6223693).

Both the Spanier patents teach rawhide being coated with inorganic pyrophosphate with the formula M_{n+2}P_nO_{3n+1} (see col. 12, lines 6-13 in both), wherein the pyrophosphates are known to be anti-tartar, anti-plaque or anti-calculus agents. (Col. 9, lines 55-60, col. 9, lines 58-59, respectively). The patents show, in addition, other additaments, see for instance, col. 13, lines 55-60 in '679. In '704 for example, the patentees teach that the coated rawhide can be used for both dogs as well as cats (col. 14, lines 25+ in '704). Also, note the amounts of pyrophosphate in Table 1, 0.25-5%. The patentees also teach using such a coating on other dog foods, such as biscuits. The patent teaches packaging such products. It would therefore, have been obvious to package the rawhide coated product too, and packaging such rawhide chews is a commonplace expedient as any store which sells such products will show.

Witt et al. teaches antiplaque antimicrobial agents in an amount of at least .01% by weight. See cetyl pyridinium chloride shown at col. 16, line 43, as such an agent. The patent also discloses tripolyphosphate as an anti-calculus agent in an amount 1.5-15%. See col. 14, line 51, col. 15, lines 17-23, line 40 and specifically line 32. The composition is applied to chews such as rawhide (col. 19, lines 7, 10-11).

Glandorf et al. also teach chews such as rawhide (col. 18, lines 11-14 which are incorporated with a composition that includes tripolyphosphates as anti-calculus agents (col. 10, lines 32-37) and from about 0.01 to 1.5% of cetylpyridinium chloride as antmicrobial benefits (col. 13, line 56, col. 14, lines 11, 33-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply on or incorporate in rawhide, with a composition such as that of Spanier et al. for its benefit as an anti-calculus agent and to combine such a composition with cetyl pyridinium salt, for its established benefit as an antimicrobial agent. To apply the amounts or to optimize the ranges shown by the above references when such a combination is made would have been within the realm of the artisan, bearing in mind the usefulness of the two ingredients, each for its established utility and benefit for rawhide application. To provide the number of chews to a pet would have been obvious also, depending on the advice of a veterinarian or as desired by the pet owner. With regard to claims 3 and 4, Perleburg et al. is exemplary in teaching the formation of rawhide chews and therefore to follow such a patent and then to apply the composition of the combination of an anticalculus agent and an antimicrobial agent both shown as being useful when applied to a rawhide, would have been obvious.

Application/Control Number: 10/623,145 Page 4

Art Unit: 1761

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. SAYALA whose telephone number is 571-272-1405.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C. SAYALA Primary Examiner

Group 1700.